

Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #920
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Wed, 22 Nov 89 Volume 89 : Issue 920

Today's Topics:

Are we ALLOWED to listen?
ARRL NR 85: NO LICENSE FEES!
Free Vacuum Forever!
FT 470
INFO-HAMS Item
military call signs.....etc.
test message
The "right to receive" (2 msgs)

Date: Wed, 22 Nov 89 11:51:48 PST
From: GOLDFINGER%ATF.MFENET@CCC.NMFECC.GOV
Subject:

Could you please put me on your E-mailing list for the INFO-HAMS digest?
Thanks

Date: Wed, 22 Nov 89 15:08:44 EST
From: mgb@apg-tecnet.apg.army.mil
Subject: Are we ALLOWED to listen?

*cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!stjhmc!f1.n234.z1.fidonet.org!Jim.Grubs
*@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Jim Grubs) replies yet again:
(And this is all out of order from many different postings)

> Pray tell, dear Jim: what is the difference between Bob's posting of
> the frequencies of department store dicks and Radio Shack's selling
> the frequencies of all the police frequencies in the USA?

*In principle, none. In practice, the shop cop frequencies (combined with a
*handheld scanner) have a much more easily implemented immediate, practical
*use. When I was a police dispatcher, my chief had a rule: "We can't stop
*them, but we can sure as hell make them fight uphill for everything they get."

Yes, I have found this to be the attitude held by various police agencies
that I have run into also. They care very much about catching the bad guys
and they sometimes start feeling that ANYTHING they can do to further that
goal is "ok". This includes harassment, restricting civil liberties,

"interpreting" the law to their advantage, etc., etc. I understand the frustration they have and sympathize with them, but I still can not condone the liberties they sometimes take with the freedoms of law abiding citizens.

I think that your postings on the matter of publishing the frequencies (and listening to) any type of law enforcement activities is a reflection of your former Chiefs advice. I.E. I can't STOP them but I can sure give them HELL (read: harass) for everything they get. Instead of petitioning the government or trying to change the policy of "Freedom of Information" from the top down, you have decided to approach it "from the bottom up", the result being that you attack, belittle and bemoan all those that while abiding by existing laws, don't happen to support your view of what is moral or "right".

The facts are that these frequencies are published by commercial activities. The fact is that the government itself will supply this information to anyone that asks (and that in itself is a pretty strong indication that they feel it to be legal).

> How in the hell will listening to security guards catch petty thieves aid
> the thieves in getting away?

*If you are the shoplifter, knowing the shop cop frequency is a helluva lot
*of help.

And if a shoplifter uses a scanner in the commission of a crime (or for the purpose of evasion) he is guilty of a violation of federal statutes and can be charged with same. You see we already have laws on the books that address the problem, but you want to carry it a step further than that and start restricting access to information for the general public. This was addressed in the "Freedom of Information" act and while you may not like it, it IS law. Please cite cases where anyone was charged and convicted of distributing "illegal" frequency lists. You see it does not matter how YOU interpret the law, it matters how OUR COURTS interpret the law. You are NOT judge, jury, and executioner, but you ARE pretty effective at giving people a hard time and that goes back earlier to what I said about "various police agencies".

> Right on. Was he trying to say that I don't have the right to listen
> to E&M radiation that somebody has SENT RIGHT THROUGH MY LIVING ROOM?!

*Listen to the "radiation" all you want. It's the message content I'm
*concerned about.

Be "concerned" all you want, but don't try to FORCE that concern on others, and when they don't agree call them "snoops" and "eavesdroppers" and accuse them of having "bad manners" etc.

*You're snoops and I'm a fuddy duddy for not approving your bad manners.

"Snoops" in your mind only, "bad manners" in your mind only and if you will notice, no one was calling you names of any kind. You are the only person that is attaching labels to people for what they happen to believe in, although I admit that there was a reference to "fascism" in one message after you attacked that poster.

I do not like to see this wonderful information asset that we have reduced to a tool for making personal insults and "to the death" verbal battles. It seems that this net is forever waging war on one thing or another and sometimes the results are interesting and sometimes they are rather offensive. To those that found my reply to Mr. Grubs distasteful please accept my sincerest apologies. I realize that now I am part of the problem instead of being part of the cure. :-(Oh well.....

M. Bitterlich
mgb@apg-tecnet.apg.army.mil
Oh yeah WA3JPY@WB4U0U

Date: 22 Nov 89 12:22:25 GMT
From: att!cbnewsc!parnass@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Bob Parnass, AJ9S)
Subject: ARRL NR 85: NO LICENSE FEES!

In article <1356@n8emr.UUCP>, gws@n8emr.UUCP (Gary Sanders) writes:
| ARRL NR 85 (ARLB085) 11/21/89
| AMATEUR LICENSE FEES HAVE BEEN DELETED FROM THE BUDGET
| RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION NOW UNDER CONSIDERATION IN CONGRESS.

Great news! That was too close for comfort. Thanks again, Gary, for your consistent posting of useful and timely info.

--

=====
Bob Parnass, AJ9S - AT&T Bell Laboratories - att!ihuxz!parnass (708)979-5414

Date: 22 Nov 89 17:34:08 GMT
From: idacrd!mac@princeton.edu (Robert McGwier)
Subject: Free Vacuum Forever!

>From article <1132@m3.mfci.UUCP>, by rodman@mfci.UUCP (Paul Rodman):
>

> In article <1989Nov20.183932.15898@Neon.Stanford.EDU> kaufman@Neon.Stanford.EDU
(Marc T. Kaufman) writes:

>>

>>Facists ALWAYS believe that THEY are the keepers of the one TRUE WORD.

>>

>

> I have the right to detect and demodulate any frequency I choose....

> Those that don't agree should perhaps close their eyes, for good. :-)

>

>

>

Paul and Mark:

I could not agree more but you should read the Electronic Communications
and Privacy Act carefully. Further, don't get caught by a sheriff in
certain New Jersey counties with a 2 meter rig that is CAPABLE of receiving
police communications or they will charge you with a crime and put you
in the klink. This is being fought here but these are the facts, as
despicable as they seem to hams and shortwave listeners and scanner buffs.

Bob

--

My opinions are my own no matter		Robert W. McGwier, N4HY
who I work for! ;-)		CCR, AMSAT, etc.

Date: 22 Nov 89 14:04:01 GMT

From: ncrlnk!ncrwic!encad!enprt!hburford@uunet.uu.net (Harry Burford)

Subject: FT 470

turner@ics.uci.edu (Clark Turner) writes:

>Just a short query about the Yaesu FT-470 that I just bought a few weeks
>ago. Does anyone know of a way to open up the receiver in the 450 mHz
>range? I have learned to toggle extended receive for the 144 mHz range
>but have no clue for the rest, if such is possible.

I have been watching this network as well as hamnet on CI\$. So far
no one has been able to extend the 70cm coverage of the 470. Please
post if you discover something.

>pay some price in intermod (just discovered). Its a nice radio and I would

>Clark S. Turner WA3JPG

Yaesu has a fix for the intermod problem. Mine is really bad, too. You will need to send your radio to Yaesu for the 'intermod fix'. It is considered to be a warrenty item. From what I understand, they will change the IF frequency so (hopefully) the intermod problems will be somewhere other than the ham band. Postings from CI\$ have said that there is MUCH improvement. You will be without your radio for a couple of weeks. I'm anxious to get mine back hb

--

Harry Burford - NCR Peripheral Products Division, Printer Products
PHONE: 316-636-8016 TELEX: 417-465 FAX: 316-636-8889
SLOWNET: 3718 N. Rock Road, Wichita KS CALL: KA0TTY
C-\$erve: 76367,151 SS: 9.5 Harry.Burford@Wichita.NCR.COM

Date: 22 Nov 89 13:05:00 PDT
From: "MUPPET::NIX" <nix@muppet.decnet@consrt.rok.com>
Subject: INFO-HAMS Item

I'm looking for some other Tentec Paragon owners who have, or are interested in, using the optional RS-232 port to control the radio.

I have an Amiga Computer and, although there aren't any 'canned' interface programs (for the Amiga), to provide access to the Paragon, I've had reasonably good results by using a public domain terminal emulator.

I have documentation on the IBM (and 'compatibles') BASIC program which Tentec sells and, have been using it to understand the format of the Status 'word' (several bytes in length) that's supposed to come back from the Amiga. There appear to be inconsistances in the portion reporting the radio's operating frequency.

If anybody's had experience in writing/modifying a computer program to control the Tentec Paragon, I'd be grateful for thoughts/comments.

Paul WB5AGF

Date: 22 Nov 89 14:59:43 GMT
From: cadre.dsl.pitt.edu!pitt!speedy.cs.pitt.edu!hoffman@pt.cs.cmu.edu (Bob Hoffman)
Subject: military call signs.....etc.

In article <8911212358.AA17672@ti.com> dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com (DUBE TODD) writes:
>... we should get concerned about our use of cordless phones. Anyone
>can park in front of your home and receive/record all your personal
>conversation that you care to "dump" into the public domain and do
>whatever he/she pleases with it;

Exactly! The ECPA specifically omitted cordless phones from its
restricted-list because they have "no reasonable expectation of privacy".
I have heard stories about how criminals have been successfully
prosecuted with evidence obtained from monitoring cordless phones.

I don't use them. If I did, I would build scrambling circuitry into it.

---Bob.

--

Bob Hoffman, N3CVL {allegra, bellcore, cadre, idis, psuvax1}!pitt!hoffman
Pitt Computer Science hoffman@cs.pitt.edu

Date: Wed, 22 Nov 89 14:58:50 GMT
From: watmath!ria.ccs.uwo.ca!uwovax.uwo.ca!mbramwel@uunet.UU.NET
Subject: test message

This is a test to see if I am able to post a message to the info-hams
digest. Sorry for any inconvenience I may have caused.

Date: 22 Nov 89 19:35:44 GMT
From: shelby!portia!jessica!paulf@decwrl.dec.com (Paul Flaherty)
Subject: The "right to receive"

In article <19891121181318.6.ED@PEREGRINE.SCRC.Symbolics.COM>
Ed@ALDERAAN.SCRC.SYMBOLICS.COM (Ed Schwalenberg) writes:
>Where did you get this idea from? It's not in the Bible, the Constitution,
>the Communications Act of 1934, the ECPA, or anyplace else that I know about.
>It's a nice idea, it's one that I approve of, but it is NOT one of the
>recognized rights of society, in the USA or in any other country.

Read the Communications Act of '34. The spectrum is defined as a PUBLIC
resource, to be managed in the best interests of the citizens. The ECPA
was a legal necessity, because up to that time, USCA34 was interpreted as
prohibiting restrictions on reception. It was thought that this interpretation
was most consistent with the first amendment.

>Governments have the unlimited right, which they have exercised in the past
>and continue to exercise, to determine not only who may transmit via radio
>and what they may transmit and when they may transmit it and what kind of
>equipment and antennas they may use, and who may fix them when they break,
>but also to regulate the reception of radio waves (including who and when
>and how and with what). The various state scanner and radar-detector laws
>are examples, as are the ECPA and the Communications Act of 1934 and the
>zoning regulations of Boulder County.

Sorry, but this is the United States, and the rights of the government are limited by the Constitution, and not those of the citizens. The FCC does have the power (subject to review by the courts) to make spectrum allocation decisions, based upon public interest. When it fails to do so, you sue them.

The actions that you mention are mostly to prohibit criminal use of the spectrum, which is consistent with public interest. Where it is not, lawmakers have sought to redress (the various exceptions to scanner laws for hams). The ECPA is bad law, and will probably wind up being deemed unconstitutional when finally challenged. The Boulder County zoning stuff is clearly an attempt to circumvent what has been called "overriding public and federal interest" in PRB-1.

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "I asked for a dissertation topic, and for my
->paulf@shasta.Stanford.EDU | sins, they gave me one."

Date: 22 Nov 89 18:35:00 GMT
From: att!cbnewsm!mhgki!rma@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (atkins, robert m)
Subject: The "right to receive"

In article <18285@bellcore.bellcore.com>, karn@ka9q.bellcore.com (Phil Karn) writes:

>
> I would argue that it is in the Constitution. Not directly, perhaps, but
> it's still there. It's the Fourth Amendment that prohibits unreasonable
> searches and seizures.
>
> Why the Fourth Amendment? Because, local oscillators notwithstanding,
> there's no way to know that someone is monitoring radio communications from
> the privacy of his home unless you break in and catch him in the act.
>
> A law, like the ECPA, that prohibits the passive reception of radio signals
> is unenforceable outside a police state. Perhaps even in one; the Soviet
> Union and China have not been thoroughly successful in their attempts to
> stop their citizens from listening to western radio broadcasts.

Phil, there's no way to know if anyone is doing anything illegal in the privacy of their own home unless you break in and catch them in the act. Does that mean you can use illegal drugs, decode encrypted cable TV or tear the "do not remove" tags from mattresses with total disregard for the law? If it is illegal to wiretap phones, then why should it not be illegal to "airtap" cellular phones. The results are the same, though the means are different. Agreed, enforcement is a problem and cellular phone conversations should be encoded, but if it is not illegal it is de facto legal and therefore, by default, approved. I don't like that idea much either.

Bob Atkins

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #920
